

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
AUGUST 6, 2003
Bay Valley Hotel & Resort
2470 Old Bridge Road
Bay City, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman
John Kolessar, Member
Steve Warren, Member
Aaron Hopper, Member
Pat Lockwood, Commission Advisor

Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman
Kirk Steudle, Member
Richard Deuell, Member
Bill McEntee, Member

Absent

John Elsinga, Member
Sue Mortel, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Gil Chesbro, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Meghann Rauscher, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Presenters

John Daly, Genesee County Road Commission
Bob Slattery, Genesee County Road Commission

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:05PM.

Approval of the June 4, 2003 Council Minutes

Vice Chairman Wieczorek moved for the approval of the June 4, 2003, meeting minutes, supported by Mr. Steudle. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

Correspondence and Announcements

Pat Lockwood announced the State Transportation Commission met the previous week and approved an additional 200 million in bonding which enables the department to defer an additional 17 projects (she can, upon request, provide a list of the projects). Secondly, Pat announced that the department will be holding a workshop with the Commission members to discuss their financial picture and indebtedness so the Commission can get an overview as to where the department stands. Pat also commented that Director Jeff had several presentations: the UP State Fair (to be held August 11th – 17th in Escanaba) headed by Larry Tibits. Director Jeff also presented the

amended Noise Abatement Policy. The policy was changed to include some federal input, and was adopted by the Commission. Pat noted there is 5 million dollars in funding available for this policy, and many communities are very interested in this. There was also concerns expressed at the meeting regarding project overruns, the Department has pledged to investigate this and report back to the Commission. The next meeting will be held in the Benton Harbor/St. Joseph area, not in Battle Creek.

Chairman Palombo asked if there were any comments about the reports submitted to the STC. Ms. Lockwood and Mr. Steudle commented that the Commission was very interested in our progress in the data collection process. Chairman Palombo suggested that we give the Commission a short presentation midway through the data collection to update on the progress. Mr. Lilly also commented that we may be able to give a report on this during the August meeting, because the budget will need to be approved. Lastly, Ms. Lockwood commented that the Commission received a RoadSoft presentation at MTU was very interested in the process, and encouraged the Council to keep the Commission informed.

Monthly and Quarterly Reports

Rick Lilly mentioned the Council should have received a monthly report for June and July, as well as, the quarterly report which included the months April through June. The quarterly report will be given to the stakeholders and legislature, the monthly reports will go to the agencies that are represented on the Council.

Rick Lilly stated there would be no committee reports because we will be covering the two items the committees discussed during July are included on today's agenda. The two items were the Procedures Manual, which Rick mentioned was well received. Rick stated that there was some concern that the work authorization needed a little more detail, and he is working to improve it. Secondly, Rick announced that there were discussions regarding pilot projects, and that John Daly (from Genesee County Road Commission) would be giving a presentation today. Also, Rick Deuell (from NEMCOG) would be giving a short comment about his culvert study.

Mr. Lilly mentioned that the State Ad Board approved \$800,000 for the data collection process, which will only last until September. All are eligible to start charging funds as of July 16th.

Lastly, Mr. Lilly noted that the Council's FY 04 budget was passed by the legislature. Rick also noted there would be no finance report because there are problems tracking costs, however, finance and budget are working to solve the problem of charging to the SPR account number instead of the Council's account number.

Update on Transportation Summit

Chairman Palombo expressed interest in the Transportation Summit and asked Mr. Steudle to comment on the meeting. Mr. Steudle commented that the summit's initiative is to develop a long-range vision for transportation in Michigan. During the second meeting participants were asked to develop a list of issues. The issues were then categorized and grouped together to form 9 separate issues. There will be separate

meetings to discuss these 9 topics, which are: asset management (system preservation), pavement management (network level), research / evaluation and data collection, land use, mobility options, communications, commerce / trade, connectivity (between modes), and funding. Mr. Steudle announced the Transportation Summit will be held in Lansing on December 3rd and 4th with approximately 600 participants, and there has been a lot of interest in attending, there may be a web cast to accommodate everyone who would like to participate. In closing, Mr. Steudle added that at the end of the Transportation Summit, participants will be asked to sign up for sub-committees work on the 9 issues.

FY 05 Draft Budget

Mr. Lilly noted that there were two areas that changes were made from the FY 04 budget, they are: the data collection, vehicle costs. After reviewing the new framework and getting more accurate mileages of ramps and divided highways, the total mileage is estimated at just under 43,100 miles and both figures (data collection and vehicle costs) were changed to reflect this. Rick also noted that the significant change in equipment costs from the FY 03 budget. The intent is to begin replacing 1/3 of equipment each year, also included in this figure is emergency dollars for special circumstances. Lastly, Rick mentioned that the FY 06 budget will be the first to reflect actual costs of the data collection process.

Vice Chairman Wieczorek moved for the approval of the FY 05 budget, supported by Mr. Hopper. Mr. Palombo asked for comments, Mr. Warren questioned the estimated \$17.54 per mile cost based on costs from M-DOT sufficiency data collection and asked when we could lock in a figure per mile. Mr. Lilly responded that the figure can be adjusted, however, at this point in the collection process we have not received accurate reports of cost, and we estimate a \$42 / hour figure. Mr. Lilly added his hesitation in changing these figures, because of our time limitation in getting the budget submitted to DMB, if need be we can shift dollars from different line items.

Mr. Lilly also mentioned that there are two upcoming AASHTO conferences on asset management. Some council members have been asked to make presentations and their costs will be covered. There has been more interest expressed from council members to attend the conferences, however, the costs will not be covered for non-presenters. We cannot obtain funding for others to attend because these costs are not one of the four directives set forth by the Governor in the budget. Mr. Lilly asked if we should request an exemption from the director. Ms. Lockwood responded that we need to draft a letter and include bottom line costs, and who is going.

The FY 05 budget was unanimously approved.

Update on Training Schedule and Data Collection

Mr. Lilly noted that 6 training sessions have been held and just over 200 individuals have received the training. There will be 4 more sessions. Rick presented the handouts which the trainees receive. The handouts include asset management council presentation (2 handouts), decision rules, RoadSoft guide, decision rules, and sealcoat

and gravel rating guides. Rick commented that the participation of the council members at the training sessions is appreciated.

Gil Chesbro, GIS Coordinator, updated the council that we currently have 4 teams out and plan to have a total of 8 teams by September. We have three counties completed and we have received the data. The counties are: Alcona, Lake, and Oceana. Mr. Chesbro noted that the remaining team is still in the field and has not yet reported in. Also, we have encountered a few problems, however, they have not prevented us from collecting or reporting the data. He added these problems were expected and we are working with LTAP to fix them. Lastly, Mr. Chesbro expressed that the data collection process is going very well, and as of now, it looks as though all 43,000 miles will be able to be collected on time.

Mr. Warren asked how the participation between M-DOT and the agencies is going during the data collection. Mr. Chesbro responded that we have not received any reports on this matter, but we should have more details for the next meeting.

Mr. Steudle asked how the interaction with the RoadSoft program was going. Mr. Chesbro replied that the modified Laptop Data Collector (LDC) program for Asset Management seemed to work very well during the test, but had not yet received comments from those out in the field. Mr. Lilly noted that the new version of the LDC created shortcut keys to ease the collection process.

Mr. Lilly also mentioned that the participation of the cities during the training has been low, however, we have received great response from the other organizations. Mr. Kolessar asked how the cities are notified of the training, and asked how as the MML representative he could assist the notification process. Mr. Lilly responded that the MPO / regional planning agencies are responsible for notifying the cities within their region. Ms. Lockwood suggested using the fax alert system used by the MML which is programmed for each city and village to aid in the notification process. Mr. Lilly added that we did not initially ask for statewide agency support, this was due to the fact that we strongly emphasized to the MPO's and regional planning agencies the need for their support in the communication and participation in this process. Furthermore, Mr. Lilly added that the regional planning agencies have been asked to submit a 1-2 page report to document their experience in this process and their likes and dislikes. Mr. McEntee asked what we do in those instances when there is no active participation. Mr. Lilly responded that we have not yet discussed this issue. This is possibly something the data committee may want to take up. Mr. Steudle asked in the instance of rural counties who do not have county participation, what is the consensus. The consensus was determined that we can make do with 2 persons, or we can ask other counties within the region, thirdly we can make the offer to the cities. Mr. Warren and Mr. McEntee asked to be notified when / if these problems, training or data collection arise. Mr. Palombo asked for public comment. The public commented that some idea of when the data collection will begin would be helpful. Mr. Chesbro responded that we can approximate dates, however, it is subject to change because all 8 crews have not yet been hired.

Discussion of Future Pilot Projects

Chairman Palombo initiated the discussion stating that we do not have a process for determining how we will spend pilot project dollars in our budget, nor do we have a process to determine which projects we will support.

Mr. Lilly added that during the administrative committee meeting staff was directed to put together some information that will set up guidelines to carry-out proposed pilot projects. Mr. Lilly also mentioned that the University Transportation Centers use a pooled fund activity and a call for projects with very specific guidelines. Mr. Lilly also noted that he will be reviewing this process and possibly using it for the basis of what we do. He also noted the committee instructed staff to have something available to award pilot projects by the first of next year. Mr. Lilly expressed his concern that we need to be sure that the pilot projects we approve are consistent with the adopted work plan. We will use the September council meeting to brainstorm ideas of where the council wants to be in the future. Mr. Warren asked when the next work plan would be developed. Mr. Lilly responded that the current work plan goes through the end of December, but does not look ahead to 2004.

Mr. John Daly and Bob Slattery gave a presentation on the Genesee County Road Commission's pilot project proposal. This pilot project is to identify major glitches and tackle them, and develop a unified methodology and approach.

The next presentation was made by Mr. Deuell regarding a proposed culvert study pilot project. Mr. Chesbro announced that pilot projects have already been done on culverts and he will attempt to make the data available to the council.

Mr. McEntee presented some comments regarding sharing data, costs and methodologies between agencies that already collect pavement data. Mr. McEntee proposes that we develop a partnership to combine efforts and eliminate duplicate efforts. However, Mr. McEntee commented that no formal request has been made at this point.

Mr. Lilly noted that there was \$120,000 approved for pilot projects for each of the next two years. The \$120,000 will expire in September, if it is not spent the money will go back to the MTF. They must be spent funds they cannot be obligated.

In closing, Mr. Lilly asked when the Council would like staff to develop criteria for proposals. Mr. Warren commented that we need to highlight key areas of interest. Mr. Lilly added we should include in the criteria that the proposal must coincide with at least one of the work plan objectives. Chairman Palombo added that we would like to have something to review by the October meeting.

Adjournment and Final Comments

Mr. Lilly indicated it may be possible to have fewer meetings for next year, we should decide our schedule during one of the upcoming meetings.

Mr. Warren suggested that we draft a letter to Ron Young to thank him for his involvement in the training and data collection process. The Council agreed.

The Council meeting for September will be moved from Lansing to Shanty Creek to accommodate those who will also be attending the RoadSoft Users Conference and County Road Association meeting. It was also suggested that we present the coverage of data, not specific data at the next meeting.

Chairman Palombo asked for comments from the public. There were no comments made.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm by Chairman Palombo.

Commission Advisor